UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/589,427	06/07/2000	Yechiam Yemini	19240-229	1117

56949 7590 10/27/2005	EXAMINER
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP	REVAK, CHRISTOPHER A

	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY	2131	

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
399 PARK AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10020

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/589,427	YEMINI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher A. Revak	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 August 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *6/13/05* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed August 11, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

2.   The applicant has argued that Win does not disclose that any association is created between the cookie and the access that was obtained used the cookie, but rather Win discloses that the cookie indicates all of the resources that the use is authorized to access. It is also argued that Win fails to analyze a second association to determine that a particular cookie was used to access a resource. The examiner disagrees with the applicant's arguments. Win discloses that date and time information of the user's last successful and unsuccessful log in attempt is returned by an access server to the user's browser which could display the date and time information, see column 10, lines 36-38. The examiner is interpreting this type of information as the second association that which is returned to the user since it indicates that the user. This information is indicative of when the user is requesting access to the protected resources and it can be determined from the date and time information the last time the user attempted access to the protected resources, see column 6, lines 9-21 and column 10, lines 36-38.

3.   The examiner notes that the applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., what the electronic security value unit is and what the security

associations are) is not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The applicant has claimed the "electronic security value unit", but it is argued that the "electronic security value unit" consists of multiple embodiments as that of a form of currency and/or is used for payment which is not claimed. Similarly, the applicant's specification recites that the associations may be separated into two parts, a first part maybe be recorded by a first bank that indicates that the currency was transmitted to a second bank making them liable and the second bank can create a second party of the first association that indicates the new recipient of the currency and these features are not claimed. The examiner is broadly interpreting the claim language of "electronic security value unit" as that of retaining any identifying information and the "association" as linking any type of information to a connection, if the applicant wishes to have the "electronic security value unit" and "association" as is recited in the specification that which is limited to currency or a form of payment and listing who is liable for the transaction, the claims will need to be amended accordingly. The examiner acknowledges that by amending the claims to recite of the subject matter listed above, it would overcome the prior art of record.

4.   The objection to the drawings is hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
> another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
> granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
> applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
> 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
> only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
> of such treaty in the English language.

6.   Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Win et al,

U.S. Patent 6,182,142. The examiner notes that the teachings of Win et al refer to both

a cookie and a token which are both interpreted as that of an "electronic security value

unit" as is claimed by the applicant.

As per claim 1, it is disclosed by Win et al of a method for identifying a client

(particular component) of an electronic system that accessed a resource of said

electronic system (col. 1, lines 5-10 and col. 2, lines 35-40). A token (electronic security

value unit) is created and distributed to the client (component)(col. 2, lines 28-40). A

first association is created between the client (component) and the cookie (electronic

security value unit) that lists the user's roles (col. 6, lines 52-59). The cookie (electronic

security value unit) is provided from the web browser, located at the client (component)

to a protected web server (resource manager) in exchange for access to the resource

(col. 6, lines 59-61 and col. 6, line 65 through col. 7, line 3). The cookie/token

(electronic security value unit) also includes a second association with the resources

wherein by analyzing the second association determines a list of customized

information that includes the user's name and role in regards to accessing the

requested resources and further includes date and time information of the time when

the user is requesting access to the protected resources (col. 3, lines 21-31; col. 7, lines

1-5; col. 9, lines 6-21; and col. 10, lines 36-38). The second association determines (by

analyzing) the client (component) accessed the resource that includes information date

and time information wherein the second association is related to the first association

that lists the user's roles (col. 7, lines 3-5; col. 6, lines 52-59; and col. 10, lines 34-38).

As per claim 2, it is disclosed by Win et al that the client (component) is a

functional group of an organization that uses client computers (components) and the

resource is a subset (group) of resources (col. 3, lines 22-23, col. 5, lines 13-18,40-45).

As per claim 3, it is taught by Win et al the cookie (electronic security value unit)

is distributed to the client (component) upon a request of the client (component) for

access to the resource (col. 6, lines 52-61).

As per claim 4, Win et al teaches of distributing the token (electronic security

value unit) from a protected server (first electronic bank) server associated with the

resource to an access server (second electronic bank) server associated with the client

(component)(col. 2, lines 28-40,50-56). The protected server (first electronic bank)

server creates and records a first part of the first association that indicates the

distribution of the cookie (electronic security value unit) to the access server (second

electronic bank) server (col. 2, lines 28-40,62-65 and col. 6, line 65 through col. 7, line

5). The access server (second electronic bank) server creates and records a second

part of the first association that indicates the distribution of the token (electronic security

value unit) to the client (component)(col. 2, lines 28-40,62-65 and col. 10, lines 56-67).

As per claim 5, Win et al discloses of creating a second association that distributes the token (electronic security value unit) from the access server (second electronic bank server) to the client (component) wherein the client (component) creates and records the second association (col. 2, lines 50-55, col. 3, lines 21-31, col. 6, lines 52-56, and col. 7, lines 1-5).

As per claims 6 and 7, Win et al teaches of encrypting the cookie (electronic security value unit) that includes a first association between the client (component) and the cookie (electronic security value unit) that lists the user's roles and a second association with the resources wherein by analyzing the second association determines a list of customized information that includes the user's name and role in regards to accessing the requested resources (col. 3, lines 21-31, col. 6, lines 52-59, col. 7, lines 1-5, and col. 11, lines 1-2). Win et al discloses of encrypting the cookies (electronic security value units) wherein it is disclosed by the examiner that encryption protects against unauthorized access, tampering, and duplication by requiring a proper key that is used to encrypt and decrypt content that is held by the authorized user to gain access to the protected, encrypted content as is known by one of skill in the art.

Conclusion

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher A. Revak whose telephone number is 571-272-3794. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 6:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher Revak
Primary Examiner
AU 2131

CR
October 26, 2005

10|26|05